

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA") and U.S. Patent 6,070,211 (hereinafter "Neal").

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Claim 1 includes a limitation of a load balancing bus signal buffer to further couple the graphics device to the graphics bus, the load balancing bus signal buffer to receive a second set of signals not to be used by the graphics device. Neither AAPA nor Neal disclose such a limitation, and therefore claim 1 is patentable over AAPA and Neal.

AAPA discloses a prior 2X mode graphics device that may be installed on an AGP bus capable of 4X mode operation (See Specification, page 2, lines 5-20). AAPA does not disclose the cited limitation of claim 1. Specifically, AAPA discloses only that:

"When the prior 2X mode AGP graphics device is installed on the AGP bus capable of 4X mode operation, the strobe complement signals in prior art systems *are not connected* at the prior 2X mode AGP graphics device."

The graphics device of claim 1 includes a load balancing bus signal buffer to receive a second set of signals not to be used by the graphics device.

According to AAPA, the strobe compliment signals are not connected at the prior 2X mode AGP graphics device. Therefore, AAPA does not disclose a buffer to receive these signals, and AAPA does not disclose the cited limitation of claim 1.

Further, Neal also does not disclose the cited limitation of claim 1. Specifically, Neal discloses a resistive load at a connection to a differential signal line pair to eliminate reflections (Col. 6, lines 42-64). The differential driver pair 410a-410b is used by each of the driver and receiver pairs 418 and 420, since the drivers 408 and 414 and receivers 412 and 416 disclosed by Neal are single-ended-to-differential drivers and differential-to-single-ended receivers (Col. 5, line 66-Col. 6, line 19), which by definition require differential inputs and outputs. As a result, Neal also does not disclose the cited limitation of claim 1, and claim 1 is patentable over AAPA and Neal.

Independent claims 8 and 15 include limitations similar to those discussed regarding claim 1. As a result, since claim 1 is patentable over AAPA and Neal, claims 8 and 15 are also patentable over AAPA and Neal. The remaining claims 2-7, 9-14, 16 and 17, depend from the above discussed independent claims 1, 8, and 15, and therefore include all the limitations of those independent claims. Since claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentable over AAPA and Neal, dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, 16 and 17 are also patentable over AAPA and Neal.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 11/15/04



Arlen M. Hartounian
Reg. No. 52,997

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300